

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

COMPLAINT

Joseph-Howard: Yennie, et uxor
Sheila-Ann: Yennie
Demandant(s)
(Plaintiff(s)),

vs.

WILLIAM H. RINGWOOD, et al. Individually
and as agent for WASHINGTON MUTUAL
HOME LOANS, and its subsidiary NORTH
AMERICAN MORTGAGE CO. and,
WILLIAM B. HARRISON, et al. Individually
and as agent for BANK ONE, NA.
Respondent(s).
(Defendant(s)).

Case No.

05-123JRT/FLN

Libel of Review / Counterclaim
In Admiralty


Re: God-given unalienable rights
in the original estate.
Article III: Constitution

Libel of Review / Claim

Comes now, Joseph-Howard: Yennie, et uxor, making a special visitation by absolute ministerial right to the district court, "Restricted Appearance" Rule E (8).

Respondant(s) has been making false claims and this counterclaim and notice of lis pendens are now in the "original exclusive cognizance" of the United States of America through the district court ~ see the "First Judiciary Act" of September 24, 1789, Chapter 20, page 77.

Jurisdiction: In International law and according to the law of the land, agents of a foreign principle are required to file any pretended claim in the appropriate district court prior to exercising rights to that claim. The district courts have "exclusive original cognizance" of all intended seizures and this includes in rem (Rule C (3)), such as Trust Organizations and Legal Names, (as well as banking) (WASHINGTON MUTUAL HOME LOANS) and (BANK ONE, NA.), Petitioner, Joseph-Howard: Yennie, et uxor, Respondent(s) WILLIAM H. RINGWOOD, as agent for WASHINGTON MUTUAL HOME LOANS and WILLIAM B. HARRISON, JR., as agent for BANK ONE, NA. within their respective districts, as well as upon the high seas: (a) saving to suitors, in all cases, the right of common law remedy, where the common law is competent to give it; and shall also have "exclusive original cognizance" of all seizure on land... The First Judiciary Act; September 24, 1789; Chapter 20, page 77. The Constitution for the United States of America, Revised and Annotated ~ Analysis and Interpretation ~ 1982,



Article III, sub-section 2, Clause 1: Diversity of Citizenship, U.S. Government Printing Office, Document 99-16, pg. 741 and (Original Banking Act).

The fact of protocol ~ Filing a claim in district court according to international law ~ is beyond dispute and extends into antiquity; “Meanwhile those who attempt to seize wreck ashore without grant from the Crown do so at their own peril”. Select Pleas in the Court of Admiralty, Volume II, A.D. 1547 ~ 1602; Introduction ~ Prohibitions, Note as to the early Law of Wreck, Sheldon Society, page XI 1897.

Even the IRS (Federal Reserve) recognizes the protocol;

“The place for filing notice; Form. Place for filing. The notice referred to in sub-section (a) shall be filed ~ With the clerk of the district court. In the office of the clerk of the United States District Court for the judicial district in which the property subject to the lien is situated.... “Title 26, U.S.C. sub-section 6323 (f) (1) (B)....

Respondent(s), WILLIAM H. RINGWOOD, et al., acting as Agent(s) for WASHINGTON MUTUAL HOME LOANS and WILLIAM B. HARRISON, JR., et al. acting as Agent(s) for BANK ONE, NA., are agents of a foreign principal, a “foreign state” defined at Title 28, U.S.C. sub-section 1603, and Title 22, U.S.C. sub-section 611. Headquartered (PA SHQ ~ signed for example, by Edwin C. Johnson by John T. Bartlett; of the Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, The Year of Crisis 1933, (Random House p. 21). The Department of Revenue, (International Bankers), of course being the execution of bankruptcy proceedings against the citizens of the United States since 1935 currently formed “International Monetary Fund” and “World Bank” etc. ~ Entity, WASHINGTON MUTUAL HOME LOANS, and BANK ONE, NA., municipal and police powers under United Nations charter law ~ protected by the same alleged positive law jural society (international treaty) exemption home rule (of for example, Article 14 of the State of Wisconsin Constitution, (“Transfer of Government.”))

The district court for the District of Minnesota has acquired exclusive cognizance of this counterclaim for the United States of America because this is a federal question ~ a Constitutional matter involving a man on the land, (American), complaining about theft and kidnap ~ Title 18, U.S.C. sub-section 661 and sub-section 1201 respectively, and irregular extradition from the asylum state into the United States custody, treason ~ Constitution,

Article III, sub-section 3 and Title 18, U.S.C. sub-section 2381 by an agent of a foreign principal, creating diversity of citizenship ~ Title 28, U.S.C. subsection 1331, 1332, and 1333 respectively. The presentment, (notification), are arbitrary and capricious, clearly implying that if Petitioner fails to comply with the suggested terms there will be "law enforcement" actions by way of inland seizure.

Speaking historically, the district, formed in 1790 for handling the financial obligations in the United States could not come into existence until after formal expression of remedy in the "saving to suitors" clause (1789) quoted above and codified at Title 28 U.S.C. sub-section 1333.

The law is paraphrased in the Internal Revenue Code: The only excuse for discretionary authority, granted administrative agencies is the judicial oversight demonstrated in this version of an Article III court.

Law of The Flag; Man is created in the image of God, in Heaven and to reduce a man to chattel against the national debt is an affront to God, Exodus 13:16 and Genesis 1:27.

STIPULATION OF ACCEPTABLE ANSWER

The answer is simple. Agents of a foreign principal are required to file their complaint in the district court prior to exercising any claim against a man, (American), on the land.

This is international and common law. Respondent(s) must directly address the validity of the search by, District Court Clerks, check of the District Court, which clearly shows there have been no claims filed against "Petitioner(s) or any pseudonym through which Petitioner(s) may be in contract. Respondent(s) may call 612-664-5000 conduct searches and of course the Article III judge can research cases in chambers. It is however reasonable to say that if Respondent(s) is moving on a valid claim and judgement in the district court, then the Respondent(s) knows what case that is. The United States is not a party in interest to this action. Any registered attorney responding for Respondent(s) cannot be a citizen of the United States due to the dejure thirteenth Amendment of the Constitution. A certified copy is attached and fully incorporated into this Libel of Review / Counterclaim. (The federal judge assigned this case is competent to adjudicate under Article III due to "inactive" status with the State Supreme Court/State Bar Association attorney register.) Addressing the certificate of search is the only response that will be considered an answer to this counterclaim. Failure to answer will be met with

1 default judgement for Petitioner(s) according to the notice on the face of the summons.

2
3 **STIPULATION OF REMEDY**

4 The recourse sought is immediate exclusive cognizance of the United States through the district court.
5 This case is repository for evidence for injunctive relief from past, present, and future presentments and theft or
6 kidnap actions from any foreign agents or principals. Any theft taken previous to this complaint must be returned
7 to the Petitioner(s). Though the theft/kidnap could be justified by notice and sophistry under the color of law of
8 municipal structure, the proceedings have been under the pretend authority of unconscionable contract and the
9 recourse requested is proper.

10 There is no excuse for the arbitrary and capricious attorney actions, debt action in assumpsit that have
11 confronted good men and women since the "Bankers Holiday".


12 Roosevelt implemented a "voluntary compliance" national debt (upon the States by Governors
13 Convention) but utilized the 1917 "Trading with the Enemy Act", to compel citizens of the United States to
14 comply. The substitution of citizen of the United States for German national on this land was against *Stoher vs.*
15 *Wallace, 255 U.S. 239 (1921)* where the court clearly expresses "The Trading with the Enemy Act, originally and
16 as amended, is strictly a war measure", directly citing the Constitution Article I, sub-section 8, Clause II. The war
17 on the "Great Depression";

18 1) does not count and, 2) would only last the duration of the emergency if it did.

19 **SANCTIONS**

20 Petitioner(s) request sanctions in the amount of not less than \$ 262,643.58, times triple damages
21 against each and all individual parties to the case.

22
23 Respectfully submitted,

24
25 
26 Joseph-Howard: Yennie, et ux
27 c/o Post Office Box 955
28 Pine Island, 55963 Minnesota
29 Cell # (507)358-0724